



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,324	12/31/2003	Raja Neogi	884.B73US1	4679
21186 7590 09/25/2007 SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A. P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			EXAMINER ALAM, MUSHFIKH I	
			ART UNIT 2623	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/25/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/750,324	Applicant(s) NEOGI, RAJA	
	Examiner Mushfikh Alam	Art Unit 2623	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Objections***

1. Claim 22 is objected to because of the following informalities: This claim depends from claim 14, it is understood that it should depend from claim 18 as it lacks antecedent basis to claim 14. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-2, 4-8, 14, 16-17, 23-24, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sezan et al. (6236395).

Claim 1, Sezan teaches a method comprising:

- receiving a signal (38) having a number of frames into a device (16) coupled to a display (80) (fig. 2);
- retrieving a past viewing profile (user description scheme) for a user of the device and at least one cue (users preference to watch only 5 minutes of a video program) regarding viewing preferences provided by the user (column 5, lines 37-43, column 6, lines 16-20, column 8, lines 30-55); and

Art Unit: 2623

- storing at least one sequence (highlights) that is comprised of at least one frame (highlights of video) based on the past viewing profile (user description scheme) of the user of the device and the at least one cue (users preference to watch only 5 minutes of a video program) regarding viewing preferences provided by the user (column 6, line 59-column 7, line 15).

Claim 2, Sezan teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising updating an electronic programming guide (list of recorded sports events) associated with the user with identification of the at least one sequence (set of title frames) that is stored (column 9, lines 54-65).

Claims 4 and 12, Sezan teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising receiving the at least one cue (user preference) from the user through a multimodal (voice, pointer) interface (column 9, lines 23-36 and lines 54-56).

Claim 5, Sezan teaches the method of claim 3, wherein receiving the at least one cue from the user through the multimodal interface comprises receiving a video sequence (highlights) from the user through the multimodal interface (column 9, line 52-column 10, line 1).

Claim 6, Sezan teaches the method of claim 3, wherein receiving the at least one cue from the user through the multimodal interface comprises receiving an audio sequence (highlights) from the user through the multimodal interface. The system

Art Unit: 2623

works for both audio and video sources (column 4, lines 6-9 and column 9, line 52-column 10, line 1).

Claim 7, Sezan teaches the method of claim 3, wherein receiving the at least one cue (entering a user preference) from the user through the multimodal interface comprises receiving text (typing an actor to view, i.e. filtering) from the user through the multimodal interface. The user may enter an actor into his preference scheme (column 4, lines 59-65, column 5, lines 37-43, column 6, lines 39-58)

Claim 8, Sezan teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising updating an electronic programming guide associated with the user based on the past viewing profile for the user of the device (column 9, lines 54-65).

Claim 14 is analyzed as an apparatus of claim 1.

Claim 16 is analyzed as an apparatus of claim 2.

Claim 17 is analyzed as an apparatus of claim 7.

Claim 23, this claims differs from claim 1 only in that "a machine readable medium" is additionally recited, which is inherently provided by the system of Sezan to perform the steps in claim 1.

Claim 24, this claims differs from claim 2 only in that "a machine readable medium" is additionally recited, which is inherently provided by the system of Sezan to perform the steps in claim 2.

Claim 26, this claims differs from claim 2 only in that "a machine readable medium" is additionally recited, which is inherently provided by the system of Sezan to perform the steps in claim 2.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3, 15, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sezan et al. (6236395) in view of Begeja et al. (2004/0025180).

Claim 3, Sezan teaches the method of claim 1, wherein storing the at least one sequence (5 minute highlight) based on the past viewing profile (user description scheme) of the user of the device and the at least one cue (basketball games) regarding viewing preferences provided by the user.

Sezan is silent regarding generating weighted scores for the number of frames based on a programming type for a program in a channel of the signal.

Begeja teaches generating weighted scores for the number of frames based on a programming type (relevance to a user) for a program in a channel of the signal paragraph [0118]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided weighted scores for user profiles as taught by Begeja to the system of Sezan to provide an indication regarding the relevance to the user's interests (paragraph [0118]).

Claim 15 is analyzed as an apparatus of claim 3.

Claim 25, this claims differs from claim 3 only in that "a machine readable medium" is additionally recited, which is inherently provided by the system of Sezan to perform the steps in claim 3.

6. Claims 9-13, 18-22, 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sezan et al. (6236395) in view of Gutta et al. (2003/0163816).

Claim 9, Sezan teaches a method comprising:

- receiving a signal (38) having a number of frames into a device (16) coupled to a display (80) (fig. 2);
- retrieving at least one cue (5 minute highlights) related to preferences of a viewer of the display, wherein the at least one cue is selected from the group consisting of a video sequence (highlights of basketball game) (column 9, line 35-column 10, line 1)

Art Unit: 2623

performing the following operations for a frame of the number of frames:

- comparing between at least one characteristic of the frame and the at least one cue (column 6, lines 39-44); and

Sezan does not teach a method comprising:

- generating a match score;
- storing the frame upon determining that the match score for the frame exceeds an acceptance threshold.

Gutta teaches a method comprising:

- generating a match score (by comparing keywords) (paragraph [0022]).
- storing the frame upon determining that the match score for the frame exceeds an acceptance threshold (threshold value) (see paragraphs [0019] and [0022]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided matching processing as taught by Gutta to the key frame detection of Sezan to receive information relating to the user preferences (see paragraph [0020]).

Claim 10, Gutta teaches the method wherein performing the following operations for the frame of the number of frames further comprises deleting the frame upon determining that the match score for the frame does not exceed the acceptance threshold. If the data does not exceed the threshold it is not stored for subsequent retrieval (see paragraph [0022]).



Claim 11, Sezan teaches the method further comprising updating an electronic programming guide associated with the user with identification of the frames of the number of frames (5 minutes worth) that are stored (column 9, lines 54-65).

Claim 13, Sezan teaches the method wherein comparing between the at least one characteristic of the frame and the at least one cue comprises generating the match score based on at least two comparisons between at least two characteristics (location and size) and at least two cues (user preferences), wherein the at least two comparisons (comparisons are made for all preferences) are weighted (importance) based on a programming type (important moments of a basketball game) for a program of which the number of frames are within (column 5, lines 10-32, column 6, lines 39-48, column 9, lines 60-65).

Gutta teaches teaches the method wherein generating the match score (paragraph [0022]).

Claim 20, Gutta teaches the system wherein the at least two characteristics in the frame are selected from the group consisting of text (key words) and audio (audio/video segments) (paragraphs [0019] and [0022]).

Claim 18 is analyzed as an apparatus of claim 9.

Claim 19 is analyzed as an apparatus of claim 13.

Claim 21 is analyzed as an apparatus of claim 12.

Claim 22 is analyzed as an apparatus of claim 11.

Claim 27, this claims differs from claim 9 only in that "a machine readable medium" is additionally recited, which is inherently provided by the system of Sezan to perform the steps in claim 9.

Claim 28, this claims differs from claim 10 only in that "a machine readable medium" is additionally recited, which is inherently provided by the system of Sezan to perform the steps in claim 10.

Claim 29, this claims differs from claim 11 only in that "a machine readable medium" is additionally recited, which is inherently provided by the system of Sezan to perform the steps in claim 11.

Claim 30, this claims differs from claim 13 only in that "a machine readable medium" is additionally recited, which is inherently provided by the system of Sezan to perform the steps in claim 13.

### ***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Gutta (2006/0053449) is cited to teach a weighting system for use with user profiles.

Cragun et al (5561457) is cited to teach a system and method for selected frames with a video stream.

Li et al. (2005/0128361) is cited to teach analyzing a football game video stream in order to detect plays and summarization.

### ***Inquiries***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mushfikh Alam whose telephone number is (571) 270-1710. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri: 8:30-18:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivek Srivastava can be reached on (571) 272-7304. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/750,324  
Art Unit: 2623

Page 11

MA  
9/11/2007

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a series of fluid, overlapping loops and strokes, positioned above the printed name.

VIVEK SRIVASTAVA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600